

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/795,905	03/08/2004	Jerry H. Roberts	20002.120	1531
7590 12/06/2005			EXAMINER	
Christopher J. Fildes Fildes & Outland, P.C.			KENNEDY, SHARON E	
20916 Mack Av			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Grosse Pointe Woods, MI 48236			3767	

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/795,905	ROBERTS ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sharon Kennedy	3767
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror e, cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed  n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 / 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ Thi 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	or election requirement.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applica ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/795,905 Page 2

Art Unit: 3767

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action or the MPEP.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant now claims that the bandage is "laminar", which is not found in the original specification and appears contradictory to the original figures, especially figure 5, and the disclosure. According to the disclosure, applicant's device contains "a center portion 20 ... formed of a fabric, light weight cellular material or similar conformable material, to act as a cushioning pad adapted to support and space a catheter and/or medical tubing a distance from a patient's skin." [Emphasis added.]

Normally the examiner would permit such an entry, and merely object the specification to having a lack of antecedent basis. However, applicant is trying to hinge patentability on this feature. Accordingly, it must be intimately disclosed in order to provide guidance to potential infringers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 3767

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated Kornerup, US 5,685,859. See figure 6 and the description therein. Note that elongate strip 143 flanks both sides of elongated section 160. Note that groove 165 may be provided with adhesive thereon. See Kornerup column 7, lines 21-23.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kornerup, US 5,685,859 in view of Bierman, US 6,689,104. Regarding claim 8, it would be an obvious engineering design choice to provide removable release liner on any adhesive coated surface in a bandage type appliance. In addition, note Bierman shows this concept is well known. See release layer 26 on the front page of the patent.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 25, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The thrust of applicant's arguments is that applicant's invention is "laminar". First, this is not found in the original specification. Certainly

applicant's bandage is generally flat, but so it the Kornerup device. Applicant's device contains "a center portion 20 ... formed of a fabric, light weight cellular material or similar conformable material, to act as a cushioning pad adapted to support and space a catheter and/or medical tubing a distance from a patient's skin." [Emphasis added.] The examiner doesn't see any difference between what is shown by applicant's figures and the Kornerup disclosure. Applicant should also be aware that the figures often exaggerate a feature to give it emphasis. In other words, drawings are not always to scale. In this regard, applicant should review the case law set forth in MPEP 2125. Further, novelty and patentability cannot hinge on a concept that hasn't been disclosed. If "laminar" is a critical, and applicant's foam pad must be distinguished from prior art foam pads for this reason alone, then there should have been some discussion regarding it in the original specification so that potential infringers can understand the scope of the claim. Finally, the arguments concerning the center portions are seen as merely word play. How do the "ends," "sides," "longitudinal directions" distinguish from Kornerup? If applicant wants to amend the claims to that applicant's cushioning foam pad is "consisting of a square," perhaps the arguments would be more convincing.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Application/Control Number: 10/795,905 Page 5

Art Unit: 3767

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

#### Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharon Kennedy whose telephone number is 571/272-4948. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor. Robert Pezzuto can be reached on 571/272-6996.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained by going to <a href="https://www.uspto.gov">www.uspto.gov</a>, clicking on "Status &IFW", entering the application number, and then clicking on one of the tabs to retrieve the appropriate information.

Sharon Kennedy
Sharon Kennedy
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3762